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From Bob:

Reciprocity is used in lots of different areas: family and interpersonal relationship, economic analyses of behavior and analyses of economic behaviors, the brain.

Definitely viewed in exchange terms, although serial reciprocity (not sure that is in any I copied) is a basis for understanding and analyzing sociobiological analyses of altruism and why altruism occurs with strangers vs. kin (you help a stranger because you might need help from a stranger in the future).
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Maintaining equitable social relations often requires reciprocating “in kind” for others’ prosocial favors.

Such in-kind reciprocity requires assessing the value of a prosocial action, an assessment that can lead

to egocentric biases in perceived value between favor givers versus favor receivers. In any prosocial

exchange, 1 person (the giver) incurs a cost to provide a benefit for another person (the receiver). Six

experiments suggest that givers may attend more to the costs they incur in performing a prosocial act than do receivers, who tend to focus relatively more on the benefits they receive. Givers may therefore expect to be reciprocated on the basis of the costs they incur, whereas receivers actually reciprocate primarily on the basis of the benefit they receive. This research identifies 1 challenge to maintaining a sense of equity in social relations and predicts when people are likely to feel fairly versus unfairly valued in their relationships

**Reciprocity Is Not Give and Take: Asymmetric Reciprocity to Positive and Negative Acts**

**Boaz Keysar, Benjamin A. Converse, Jiunwen Wang, and Nicholas Epley, University of Chicago**
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Unlike economic exchange, social exchange has no well-deﬁned ‘‘value.’’ It is based on the norm of reciprocity, in which giving and taking are to be repaid in equivalent measure. Although giving and taking are colloquially assumed to be equivalent actions, we demonstrate that they produce different patterns of reciprocity.In ﬁve experiments utilizing a dictator game, people reciprocated in like measure to apparently prosocial acts of giving, but reciprocated more selﬁshly to apparently antisocial acts of taking, even when the objective outcomes of the acts of giving and taking were identical. Additional results demonstrate that acts of giving in social exchanges are perceived as more generous than objectively identical acts of taking, that taking tends to escalate, and that the asymmetry in reciprocity is not due to gaining versus losing resources. Reciprocity appears to operate on an exchange rate that assigns value to the meaning of events, in a fashion that encourages prosocial exchanges.
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Reciprocity is one of the defining features of social exchange and social life, yet exchange theorists have tended to take it for granted. Drawing on work from a decade-long theoretical research program, I argue that reciprocity is structured and variable across different forms of exchange, that these variations in the structure of reciprocity have profound effects on the emergence of integrative bonds of trust and solidarity, and that these effects are explained and mediated by a set of risk- and conflict-based processes. I discuss the consequences of this work for organizational theories of embeddedness and the production of social capital through network ties. Finally, I ask how the structure of networks and the structure of reciprocity are related to one another, and explore possible implications of the structure of reciprocity for exchange theorists’ assumptions about actor motivations. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2010 APA, all rights reserved)
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